

i. Proposal number.# 2001-K200*

ii. Short proposal title .# Mill Creek Anadromous Fish Adaptive Management Plan*

APPLICABILITY TO CALFED ERP GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

1a1. Link to ERP Strategic Goals: What Strategic Goal(s) is /are addressed by this proposal? List the letter(s) of all that apply.

- A. At-risk species**
- B. Rehabilitate natural processes**
- C. Maintain harvested species**
- D. Protect-restore functional habitats**
- E. Prevent non-native species and reduce impacts**
- F. Improve and maintain water quality# A***

1a2. Describe the degree to which the proposal will contribute to the relevant goal. Quantify your assessment and identify the contribution to ERP targets, when possible.# This proposal will contribute to the passage of spring-run chinook salmon in Mill Creek by providing minimum passage flows. The ERP target and action is to increase the flow in Mill Creek by developing a cooperative approach for the lower 8 miles of the stream. This proposal is consistent with the ERP target.*

1b. Objectives: What Strategic Objective(s) is/are addressed by this proposal? List Objective (from the table of 32 objectives) and describe potential contribution to ERP Goals. Quantify your assessment, when possible.# Goal 1, Objective 1. This will contribute to the recovery of at-risk species, primarily spring-run chinook salmon.*

1c. Restoration Actions: Does the proposal address a Restoration Action identified in Section 3.5 of the PSP? Identify the action and describe how well the proposed action relates to the identified Restoration Action.# Yes. It is described in the section on Natural Flow Regimes, specifically, evaluation of flows to eliminate flow-related barriers to fish migration and how it affects habitat availability and quality for various life stages of fish.*

1d. Stage 1 Actions: Is the proposal linked directly, indirectly or not linked to proposed Stage 1 Actions? If linked, describe how the proposal will contribute to

ERP actions during

Stage 1.# This action is not directly specified in the list of Stage 1 actions. Indirectly it addresses the development and implementation of outreach, coordination, and partnering programs with local landowners and individuals, cities, counties, reclamation districts, water authorities, irrigation districts, and other interest groups to assure participation in planning design, implementation, and management of ecosystem restoration projects. It is also linked to the following Stage 1 action: provide incremental improvements in ecosystem values throughout the Bay-Delta system by developing partnerships with farmers on "environmentally friendly" agricultural practices.*

1e. MSCS: Describe how the proposal is linked to the Multi-Species Conservation Strategy and if it's consistent with the MSCS Conservation measures. Identify the species addressed and whether the proposal will "recover", "contribute to recovery" or "maintain" each species.# The proposal is directed primarily at spring-run chinook salmon and to a lesser extent, fall-run chinook salmon. The proposal will provide measurable benefits to each species. Both runs are identified in the MSCS as "recover" species.*

1f. Information Richness/Adaptive Probing related to the proposal: Describe the degree to which the proposal provides information to resolve one of the 12 scientific uncertainties (Section 3.3 of the PSP), and whether the proposal offers a prudent approach to answer these uncertainties.# It addresses a constrained version of Natural Flow Regimes. One aspect addressed by this proposal is the monitoring and modeling to determine fish passage flows past flow-related barriers and simulation and operational modeling to evaluate options for obtaining water to meet environmental needs. This proposal has presented conceptual models, hypotheses, and a monitoring program to collect the desired data.*

1g. Summarize comments from section 1a through 1f related to applicability to CALFED goals and priorities. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# This is a good proposal. It provides a three year program to determine how to best manage a block of water to improve upstream and downstream passage of spring and fall chinook salmon on Mill Creek. Part of the program is to develop biological triggers that test the hypotheses regarding passage. It is an attractive and innovative approach to adaptively managing flows to provide specific ecological benefits.*

APPLICABILITY TO CVPIA PRIORITIES

1i. Describe the expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish. Specifically identify the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, the expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production for each species and race of anadromous fish, the certainty of the expected benefits, and the immediacy and duration of the expected contribution. Provide quantitative support where available (for example, expected increases in population indices, cohort replacement rates, or reductions in mortality rates).# The applicant proposes to conduct four tasks focused around a water

acquisition that the applicant hopes to complete soon (the acquisition itself is not part of this proposal). Each of the tasks differs in their expected contribution to natural production. The first task, Adaptive Management and Monitoring, will develop a plan to adaptively manage the acquired water and will monitor the effects of the water. The plan and associated monitoring will not directly benefit natural production of anadromous fish, but could benefit anadromous fish if the water is acquired and the plan and monitoring lead to improved management of the acquired water. The proposal targets spring-run and fall-run chinook salmon. Steelhead could also benefit. The magnitude of the benefit could range from no benefit to considerable benefit, but benefit is likely limited to dry years and will only result if the plan leads to improved management of the water. Benefits are uncertain and will not be immediate, mostly because benefits depend on the water being acquired and the plan and monitoring developed to the extent that improved water management results. If the plan and monitoring result in improved water management, then the benefits will likely be long term.

The second and third tasks, Groundwater Potential and Water Conservation, are focused on finding replacement water for the seller and will not directly or likely indirectly benefit anadromous fish.

The fourth task, Conservancy Fund, will dedicate funds for "fish passage monitoring, riffle modification, assessment, research and education on Mill Creek." Although each of the named activities could benefit anadromous fish, the magnitude, certainty, immediacy, and duration of the expected benefits can't be assessed without better definition of the projects to be funded.*

1j. List the threatened or endangered species that are expected to benefit from the project. Specifically identify the status of the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, any other special-status species that are expected to benefit, and the ecological

community or multiple-species benefits that are expected to occur as a result of implementing the project.# If the Adaptive Management and Monitoring task benefits anadromous

fish, then it is most likely to benefit spring-run chinook salmon(threatened) and possibly fall-run chinook salmon (candidate for listing) and steelhead (threatened). Benefits to other special-status species, the ecological community or other species are unlikely because the flows augmentations will likely be short-term and focused on salmon passage in below-normal and dry years.

Groundwater Potential and Water Conservation tasks are unlikely to benefit threatened or endangered species or the ecological community because they are focused on finding replacement water for the seller.

The Conservancy Fund task could benefit threatened or endangered species or the ecological community, depending on the projects funded.*

1k. Identify if and describe how the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values. Specifically address whether the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values, whether the project promotes natural processes, and the immediacy and duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values.# The Adaptive Management and Monitoring task and Conservancy Fund

task could benefit natural channel and riparian habitat values, but benefits are likely to be minimal because the tasks are focused on improving salmon passage in below-normal and dry years. If the Conservancy Fund is used to modify riffles, then it could have a direct effect on natural channel and riparian habitat values, but whether the modifications improved or damaged values and the immediacy and duration of those effects would depend on the type and extent of the modifications. The Groundwater Potential and Water Conservation tasks are unlikely to protect or restore natural channel and riparian habitat values because they are focused on finding replacement water for the seller.*

1l. Identify if and how the project contributes to efforts to modify CVP operations. Identify the effort(s) to modify CVP operations to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Efforts to modify CVP operations include modifications to provide flows of suitable quality, quantity, and timing to protect all life stages of anadromous fish as directed by Section 3406 (b)(1)(B) of the CVPIA, including flows provided through management of water dedicated under Section 3406(b)(2) and water acquired pursuant to Section 3406(b)(3).# This project will not contribute to efforts to modify CVP operations.*

1m. Identify if and how the project contributes to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA. Identify the supporting measure(s) to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Supporting measures include the Water Acquisition Program, the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, and others.# Depending on the information gained and the monitoring conducted, portions of the Adaptive Management and Monitoring task and Conservancy Fund task could support the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, 3406 (b)(16), or the Water Acquisition Program, 3406(b)(3).*

1n. Summarize comments from section 1i through 1m related to applicability to CVPIA priorities (if applicable, identify the CVPIA program appropriate to consider as the source of CVPIA funding [for example, the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Habitat Restoration Program, Water Acquisition Program, Tracy Pumping Plant Mitigation Program, Clear Creek Restoration Program, Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, and Anadromous Fish Screen Program]). Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# The applicant proposes to conduct four tasks focused around a water acquisition that the applicant hopes to complete soon (the acquisition itself is not part of this proposal). Two tasks, the Adaptive Management and Monitoring task and Conservancy Fund task, could benefit anadromous fish (including listed spring-run chinook salmon), natural channel and riparian habitat values, and supporting measures in the CVPIA. These tasks are not defined well enough to assess the magnitude, certainty, immediacy or duration of the benefits. These tasks could be funded through the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, 3406(b)(1), and portions of these tasks could be funded through Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, 3406 (b)(16). At least the Adaptive Management and Monitoring task depends on successful completion of the water acquisition. The two remaining tasks, Groundwater Potential and Water Conservation, are focused on finding replacement water for the seller and will not benefit anadromous fish, protect and restore natural channel and riparian habitat values, or contribute to implementation of supporting measures in the CVPIA.*

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS

2a. Did the applicant explain how the proposed project relates to other past and future ecosystem restoration projects, as required on page 57 in the PSP? Type in yes or no.#yes*

2b. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on other information on restoration projects available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, describe how the proposed project complements other ecosystem restoration projects, including CALFED and CVPIA. Identify projects or types of projects that the proposed project would complement, now or in the future. Identify source of information.#

There are three projects in the area with the potential to complement one another. The Los Molinos Mutual Water Company cooperates with DFG and other State agencies to provide beneficial flows for fish. The applicant, in a separate proposal with the Department of Interior, plans to acquire water from Los Molinos Water Company, which will presumably be managed to meet or complement some of the objectives of the existing agreement. This proposal is to develop an adaptive management plan for the water that is yet to be acquired, study water conservation and conjunctive use potential to make up the water that has yet to be acquired, and set up a conservancy fund to conduct monitoring and restoration on Mill Creek. Each of these could complement or replace existing efforts. Source: Proposal*

RESULTS AND PROGRESS ON PREVIOUSLY FUNDED CALFED AND CVPIA PROJECTS, INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3a1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports and data available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, has the applicant previously received CALFED or CVPIA funding? Type CALFED, CVPIA, both, or none.#none*

3a2. If the answer is yes, list the project number(s), project name(s) and whether CALFED or CVPIA funding. If the answer is none, move on to item 4.#

3b1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, did the applicant accurately state the current status of the project(s) and the progress and accomplishments of the project(s) to date? Type yes or no.#

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:##

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#

REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#no*

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#

3e2. Based on the information presented in the summary and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, is the project ready for next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

4a. Does the proposal describe a plan for public outreach, as required on page 61 of the PSP? Type yes or no.# Yes*

4b. Based on the information in the proposal, highlight outstanding issues related to support or opposition for the project by local entities including watershed groups and local governments, and the expected magnitude of any potential third-party impacts.# The applicant identifies steps they have taken to address local concerns and to keep local interests up-to-date on their project, including efforts to meet with local groundwater management entities to address concerns about impacts to groundwater supplies.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# Everything looks good.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.#None*

COST

5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.# yes*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

5a - 5d.# Applicant states tasks

are inseparable, but did not clearly address if project could be annually funded. Overhead is quoted at 30%. Consulting service contracts are provided as lump-sum amounts with no further detail.*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# yes*

6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or doesn't matter.# federal*

6c. List cost share given in proposal and note whether listed cost share is identified (in hand) or proposed.

6c1. In-kind:# no*

6c2. Matching funds:#

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# \$0%*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions

6a - 6c3.# Applicant states that

USBR/USFWS will fund acquisition of 7.5% Decree water supply for an undefined sum.*